

University of Dayton
eCommons

[Senate Documents](#)

[Academic Senate](#)

11-23-1993

DOC 1991-02 Process for Evaluating Non-tenured and Tenured Faculty

University of Dayton. Faculty Board

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Board, "DOC 1991-02 Process for Evaluating Non-tenured and Tenured Faculty " (1993). *Senate Documents*. 146.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/146

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE Process for Evaluating Non-tenured and Tenured Faculty

SUBMITTED BY Faculty Board (Revised by Faculty Affairs Committee)

DATE November 27, 1991; May 8, 1992; November 23, 1993

Indicate the action required: Legislative, Concurrence, or Consultation, and refer to the appropriate reference in the Senate Constitution (Article IIB, 1, 2, 3).

ACTION IS: Legislative REFERENCE IS: Article IIB, 1c

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: State objectives, rationale, and how proposal is to be implemented.

The faculty evaluation policy approved by the faculty in 1977 has been only inconsistently implemented throughout the University. The lack of a clear system of administrative control and a clear implementation plan have combined to make the policy virtually unenforceable.

This proposal seeks to set some minimum standards for faculty evaluation based on the guidelines proposed in the 1977 document. To that end, the proposal recommends a collaborative, individual improvement process for the faculty--a faculty development focus that will not only promote faculty growth but will benefit the University as well.



The University of Dayton

November 30, 1993

TO: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee *YRC*

RE: Tenured Faculty Evaluation Policy

The Faculty Affairs Committee has completed revision of the University Policy for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. A sub-committee revised the document based on written and verbal comments made at the open meetings held last spring. Further revisions were made at meetings of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The document was approved by all members present at the November 22, 1993 meeting.

UNIVERSITY POLICY FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

Introduction

The University of Dayton is an institution of higher learning whose distinctive purpose is to illuminate its teaching, scholarship, and service with elements of the Catholic, Marianist tradition. The University regards faculty development as beneficial to the individual faculty member, students, department, and University. For purposes of this evaluation process, tenured faculty are considered to be mature and accomplished teachers and researchers. Because goal-setting is an important component of the process, the goals faculty members set for themselves should be personally meaningful and have broad significance for the advancement of teaching and discovery. Clearly a spirit of collaboration and collegiality is essential to the success of the process.

I. Assumptions

- A. The primary purpose of evaluation of faculty is to provide systematic feedback for continuous self-improvement and to assess competence and achievement in teaching, research, and service.
- B. Effective evaluation systems have the following characteristics:
 1. they incorporate goal setting as a major activity;
 2. they focus on the unique needs of the individual evaluated;
 3. they encourage the integration of individual and organizational performance;
 4. they foster positive working relationships among faculty;
 5. they clarify performance expectations; and
 6. they have procedures to resolve disagreements between faculty and departmental chairpersons.
- C. An evaluation procedure must be cognizant of both the academic freedom and academic responsibility of a faculty member.
 1. Because of the creativity and innovation that is expected of faculty in universities, a firm guarantee of academic freedom is essential. Faculty must be able to direct their own agendas in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Excessive institutional controls on faculty activity may diminish the respect the faculty member's work receives in the academic community, as well as the intellectual reputation of the institution with which the faculty member is associated.
 2. Corresponding to the academic freedom of faculty members is faculty responsibility. In the teaching area, faculty have a responsibility to communicate useful and important knowledge and skills to students and to consult with peers concerning the appropriate instructional knowledge base in their fields. Similarly, research activities should be sensitive to the

prevailing state of knowledge in the field, and faculty should consult with peers on the development of socially useful research agendas. In the area of service, faculty have a responsibility to engage in activities which are deemed useful by their colleagues in furthering the goals of the university and their discipline.

3. Nothing in this document should be interpreted to restrict the academic freedom that is so important to the academic enterprise. Rather, given the choices of direction faculty have made in the areas of teaching, research, and service, the document develops a methodology for assessing the performance of faculty against their own standards and the standards of their peers.

In light of these assumptions, a process for the evaluation of tenured faculty consists of three components: goal setting; evaluation; and peer review.

II. Goal Setting

- A. Goals for each faculty member shall be agreed upon by the faculty member in collaboration with the department chair and/or department committee. The faculty of each department will determine whether the department chair, department committee, or a combination of both will serve this function.
- B. Goals should be set at the beginning of every 2 year evaluation period and reviewed annually thereafter.
- C. The department chair provides counsel with respect to the clarity and appropriateness of the goals submitted by the faculty member.
- D. The department chair should make sure that the institution and/or department's priorities in teaching, research, and service are accounted for within individual faculty goals. When disagreement over goals occurs, appeals are to be made to the appropriate dean through written communication, with the Dean's decision being utilized in the evaluation process.
- E. At the goal-setting meeting, agreement shall be reached on:
 1. Steps the faculty member will take to address each goal;
 2. Criteria for assessing goal achievement; and
 3. Supportive steps to be taken by the department chair to facilitate goal achievement.

III. Evaluation

- A. Once goals are agreed upon, the faculty member and department chair may make arrangements to meet at appropriate times during the year to assure that plans are carried out in the spirit intended.

- B. The faculty member and department chair will meet at the end of each year to assess progress and to discuss faculty growth plans.
- C. A copy of the written biennial report will be given to the faculty member prior to its submission to the dean. The faculty member will be required to sign the report, indicating an understanding of its contents, and will have the right to attach a response.
- D. Evaluation will occur in the areas of teaching, research, and service with agreement between faculty member and departmental chair being reached on the portion of a faculty member's time devoted to each area. Evaluation criteria will vary widely depending upon the discipline.

1. Teaching:

This will be evaluated using such items as but not limited to: student ratings, peer observation or other evaluations, quality of syllabi and other teaching materials, quality of student advisement, maintenance of office hours for students, and any other data deemed appropriate by the department faculty.

2. Research:

This will be evaluated using such items as but not limited to: papers delivered at national and regional meetings of learned societies, publication of books, monographs, and journal articles, on-going research projects, editorships, membership on editorial review boards, research grant proposals and/or acquisitions, participation in juried shows, musical or theatrical performances and participation in invitational shows that reflect research.

3. Service:

This will be evaluated using such items as but not limited to: active participation on program, department, College or School, and University committees, development of new courses or programs, and willingness to accept departmental work assignments; administrative service to professional organizations through offices held and other professional activities; consultantships to agencies or organizations in the community and involvement in community-based agencies/organizations through volunteer work on boards.

IV. Peer Review

- A. Peer review is to be included in the faculty member's evaluation process at least once each six years. These reviews are separate from those annual department reviews required by salary increases, promotions, etc. and the biennial chair review. The six year period commences once a faculty member is notified of tenure status during the sixth year of service.

- B. Peer review involves the creation of a peer review team which may include any university faculty member with the exception of the faculty member's dean, chair, or other administrator to which the faculty member reports directly.
- C. The mechanisms for selection of the peer review team shall be developed by the College and the Schools.
- D. The decision on the construction of the peer review team should involve input from the faculty member, the department chair, and the departmental faculty.
- E. Faculty members must submit to the peer review team documentation of their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
- F. In addition to the documentation submitted by the faculty member being evaluated, documentation which the peer review team may examine includes, but is not limited to:
 - 1. goals developed by the faculty member and chair in the biennial review
 - 2. administrative biennial and annual salary reviews
 - 3. classroom observation and/or videotapes
 - 4. videotaped performances
 - 5. student evaluation data
 - 6. internal and/or external reviews of scholarly works/activities
 - 7. other professional activities
- G. After review and analysis of all the documentation collected, the peer review team shall prepare a written report of its conclusions. This report should be conveyed to the faculty member. The report along with any faculty reply should be submitted to the department chair who will subsequently transfer the document to the dean.